

APPENDIX D

STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW CONVERSATION NOTES AND SUMMARIES

this page left blank intentionally

Copies to: FILE

Kick-Off Meeting & On-Site Assessment

**Peavey Plaza HSR
Minneapolis, Minnesota
MDA# MPW1501**

This Meeting			Next Meeting		Minutes Prepared By:
Date	Start Time	End Time	Date	Start Time	Jean Turck
10/27/15	11:00	1:00	TBD		

Attended By:

Name	Firm/Dept.	Phone	Email
Steve Collin	Minneapolis Public Works	612.673.5695	steve.collin@minneapolismn.gov
Heidi Hamilton	Minneapolis Public Works	612.673.3316	heidi.hamilton@minneapolismn.gov
Mike Kennedy	Minneapolis Public Works	612.673.3759	mike.kennedy@minneapolismn.gov
Jennifer Swanson	Minneapolis Public Works	612.673.2529	jennifer.swanson@minneapolismn.gov
Peter Brown	Consultant to Minneapolis Public Works	612.501.9590	
Bill Bloemendal	American Engineering	612.965.9288	wbloemendal@amengtest.com
Roy Kaplan	CMS Collaborative	831.425.3743	rkaplan@cms-collaborative.com
Jean Garbarini	Damon Farber	612.332.7522	jgarbavini@damonfarber.com
Matthew Bean	Flair Fountains	612.724.3655	mattbean@flairfountains.com
Michael Ramerth	Meyer Borgman Johnson	612.604.3605	mrmerth@mbjeng.com
Chuck Liddy	Miller Dunwiddie (MDA)	612.278.7777	cliddy@millerdunwiddie.com
Denita Lemmon	Miller Dunwiddie (MDA)	612.278.7730	dlemmon@millerdunwiddie.com
Wing Kong	Miller Dunwiddie (MDA)	612.278.7762	wkong@millerdunwiddie.com
Jean Turck	Miller Dunwiddie (MDA)	612.278.7702	jturck@millerdunwiddie.com
Kevin [last name?]	Mortenson Construction		
Rhonda Pierce	Pierce Pini	763.537.1311	rhonda@piercepini.com
Michael White	Schuler Shook	612.339.5958	mwhite@schulershook.com

A summary of this meeting includes the following items:

NEW BUSINESS

Item	Description	Action By
1.1	<p>Chain of Command and Contacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are able to use Orchestra Hall and Westminster Presbyterian Church for meetings – Thank you to the City for arranging this meeting at Orchestra Hall MDA will report to Peter Brown Consultants report to Denita Lemmon – although contact Jean Turck too Jean Turck is assembling the Report along with Melissa Christenson Ekman until Melissa is out on maternity leave near 	Info

Item	Description	Action By
	the beginning of January – Denita Lemmon and Chuck Liddy to edit	
1.2	<p>Project Intent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Melissa has sent background information we have received so far via Newforma – if there were any issues downloading the information or you did not receive the information, please contact Jean • HSR is to reiterate nomination and historical issues • Team will be determining the existing conditions – what has happened to the site over 40 years? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ AET will do testing of materials ○ Does Flair or others have any photos or video of the fountain operating • Conceptual approaches – Not Schematic Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To address accessibility to different levels ○ Cost model of the approaches – Mortenson 	Info Flair All Mortenson
1.3	<p>Due to sensitivity of project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No consultants to talk to Media – refer to Peter • Practice “Communications Discipline” 	Info
1.4	<p>Protocol for requesting, providing, sharing information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All requests to City must go through MDA • Jean Turck: jturck@millerdunwiddie.com, OR • Melissa Christenson Ekman: mekman@millerdunwiddie.com 	Info
1.5	<p>MDA On-site Observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plaza is in good shape considering <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ little distress on concrete ○ AET looking at where to core drill • Erosion issues – what should be? Go back to the original appearance? • Pump room does leak at the roof – Wing at MDA will evaluate. • There will need to be further investigation into if/how pool leaks given detailed construction • Looking closely at character defining features and how they should be treated – must use Secretary of Interior Standards. • Ramp doesn’t meet accessibility and is Orchestra Hall’s property • Which elements have changed? • The team will need Nicollet Mall drawings to know what the adjacent project will be. <p>Damon Farber Observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing cosmetic changes are easily reversible • Jean will meet with the Park Board Forester to go over plantings • HSR will determine original intent of the design some things may 	Info MDA DF CMS City

Item	Description	Action By
	<p>be allowed to change if the original design intent is met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This includes the existing trees, where it may not necessarily about health of trees. • HSR will be about the whole picture. <p>Roy's Observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to understand what we do/do not know. • Important to understand how it originally worked and how it has changed • Useful to do a comprehensive survey <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Plumbing schematic should be done ○ Figure piping sizing ○ Valves – where they are ,what they did ○ Original drawings don't have enough information are there other drawings archived somewhere? ○ Flair would have been around to design the fountain • Pump room would largely be gutted <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ None of the pumps work according to Steve • Is anyone still around who saw it working in the first year or so? • Automated filtration should be done • Modern control system should be added so operation doesn't need to be done manually • 500 year event did overwhelm the sumps and flooded the room <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pumps should be variable speed – have wind sensor/control • Currently the energy used to pump water to tubes is great and inefficient • Could we ask Friedburg? Do they have a file? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jean G. has a relationship and should ask – Peter • We've only heard about lighting in pools but there is no evidence of other than a detail. • According to maintenance crews, we can't pull new wiring through old conduits because they are too full. • More power is being drawn than is being supplied • Are pumps burning out because they aren't getting enough power? • How is it leaking? • Concrete basins look intact – not leaking 1000's gallons/day • Infrared may help find cold spots • Can pools be filled with all outlets plugged? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does it go down and to what height? ○ Is there movement in water at valves and drains? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Test with biodegradable ink? ▪ Test wells along sidewalk? • What needs to be tested? How to isolate the variables? • Pool, drains, water line, well – where is it leaking? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No water shows up at the neighbors – no complaints ○ Sump pumps are only method of discharge – below sewer 	

Item	Description	Action By
	<p>system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What happens when turned off at night? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Upper pools drained down ▪ No check valves ▪ It's possible the sump pumps kicked the water out as the only method of overflow, then system needed to be refilled ○ Evaporation and splash will account for 100's of gallons in summer ○ Pipes could be leaking <p>How do we determine this with current schedule?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flooding the pools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ City to approve filling the pools ○ Would have to bring in water, truck, hydrant? ○ Be cleaned, debris shouldn't plug potential leaks ○ Prepared ○ Plugs ○ Flair to observe • City crews preparing for winter right now • Roy would like to see it run to make sure water problem isn't with system <p>When developing drawings for the HSR, each pool should have a unique designation with information on valves and elevations</p> <p>Water test in spring? March/April – totally depends on weather Can we get ready in two weeks to find out everything? Fill once would be best – Heidi Amount of plugs is sizeable</p> <p>Report could be written with conclusions based on testing in spring Schematic could be created this fall</p>	
1.6	<p>AET Testing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bill – not unusual to use current to help locate plumbing and electrical – on surface and depth <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A broken pipe will put out a different signal ○ Camera 1-1/4" diameter and can go hundreds of feet ○ Use existing drawings as guide • Core will need to go through somewhere, replicate drain hole • X-ray for rebar – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ little corrosion from rebar, very few exposed bars, very minor – Mike. ○ Bridge is worst – Peter • Cores from under and within walls to understand make-up of concrete <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Will be able to direct what concrete or repairs 	Info AET

Item	Description	Action By
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Will direct type of water treatment ○ Could we have a conclusion about future life expectancy? Paste erosion is what is happening, may not continue • Higher Ph is better – 7 is best • Prosoco – test how to remove graffiti materials depending on petrograph • Flair – pressure test • Parameters development could take 1-2 weeks • 	
1.7	<p>Civil – storm and sanitary sewer at perimeter is inconclusive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sumps go to sanitary currently and would in the future but could be treated to go to storm • No storm water management right now <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Could it be retained to be used onsite to irrigate? ○ Lawn areas drain into pool – fertilizing fountain ○ No irrigation system other than exposed strapped on system ○ Planters don't have drains – how is that not corroding the concrete? ○ Storm water management per code is only required if more than one acre is disturbed 	Info
1.8	<p>Group Interviews</p> <p>MDA will conduct Interviews outlined in the Proposal and will coordinate with Peter and Heidi.</p>	MDA
1.9	<p>Schedule</p> <p>Has moved one month due to contracting</p> <p>MDA will conference call Roy in – he has only one visit scheduled</p> <p>MDA work with Peter and Heidi on scheduling</p>	Info
2.0	<p>Billing procedures</p> <p>MDA bills first week of each month for previous month – usually by 7th of month</p> <p>Invoices must include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MDA Commission Number: MPW1501 • City's Contract Number: C-40018 • City's PO Number: 521629 • Consultant Fixed Fee Amount and percentage being billed 	MDA Consultants

The above represents the writer's impressions of the meeting. Please notify them of any errors, omissions or discrepancies.

Date: 4 December 2015

RE: Peavey Plaza Historic Structures Report and Existing Condition Study
City Update

From: Denita Lemmon

A) Stakeholder Progress Meeting - Tuesday Dec 8

- 1) Review content of powerpoint

B) Testing Scope

- 1) Review scope
- 2) Schedule to be determined based on weather
- 3) Impact to overall schedule to be determined

C) Timeline Narrative and Graphic

- 1) Ongoing – intent to have draft complete by January Stakeholder Progress Meeting
- 2) A separate timeline will be developed to understand and list failures/concerns identified during construction.

D) System Review

- 1) Summary of CMS findings from site visit
- 2) Information from 'box' will be distributed for team to supplement their observations/understandings of systems

E) Interview scheduling/follow-up

- 1) Julie, MNOrchestra has been contacted to schedule/coordinate meeting with MNOrchestra
- 2) MDA to schedule meeting with DC/DID/GM
- 3) Should there be a meeting with surrounding properties other than Stakeholder Progress Meetings? - Westminister, restaurants/pubs, YWCA, other residents
- 4) Is Stakeholder Progress Meeting sufficient to engage with SHPO, HPC and others in preservation community? Should this be combined interview? Who should be invited from each organization?

Date January 5, 2015

Project Name Peavey Plaza HSR

DFA Number 15-162

Attendees: Denita Lemmon, Miller Dunwiddie
 Chuck Liddy, Miller Dunwiddie
 Peter Brown, City of Minneapolis
 Jean Garbarini, Damon Farber
 Greg Geiger, Manager of Concert Enhancements and Concessions, MOA
 David Sailer-Haugland, Director of Marketing, Subscription Sales and Audience Services, MOA
 Scott Feldman, Event and Facility Sales Manager, MOA
 Dan Kupfer, Director of Facilities, MOA
 Kevin Smith, CEO and President, MOA

By: Jean Garbarini, Damon Farber

Subject MOA input on relationship/programming of Peavey Plaza

BUSINESS

1. Introductions – Denita, Chuck and Peter
 - 1.1. Explained the goals and scope of the project and the team members involved.
 - 1.2. Gave a synopsis of findings to date, including plaza history, modifications, etc. and presented graphic exhibits.
1. MOA views Peavey Plaza as an extension of their performance and service platform and feel that it is a great place to be especially when the fountains are working and the space is being maintained.
2. The MOA uses the space for large events and would like a bit more connectivity – the new terrace feels too cut off/removed from the plaza. It can be cumbersome to have a reception in the plaza for MOA patrons with the lack of direct connectivity that used to exist. Conversely, the private quality to the terrace can be an advantage for MOA small private events.
3. The MOA is open to considering alteration of their facility – within reason – to create a better flow to the plaza.
4. Fiber Optic was brought nearly to the plaza with the MOA renovation – MDA to confirm.
5. Functional requirements for maneuvering equipment into the space needs better thought. Currently equipment, staging, rigging, etc is craned into the space from 12th street. A ramp for equipment use would ideally accommodate a forklift to the lower level.
6. The MOA uses Apres Party and Tent Rental for event equipment.
7. The MOA would like Sommerfest to be a large event once again, extending beyond the walls of the MOA.
8. MOA loves the use of water in the plaza and see it as a positive attribute
9. MOA would like to see food trucks easily accommodated adjacent or in the plaza

Date January 12, 2016

Project Name Peavey Plaza HSR

DFA Number 15-162

Subject Peavey Plaza HSR Public Meeting #2 - Minutes

MINUTES

1. Introductions – Chuck Liddy (moderator)
2. Self-Introduction of meeting attendees (City of Minneapolis Jennifer Swanson, Steve Kotke, Aaron M. Hanauer), Public
3. Chuck presented project slides, explained current work efforts including stakeholder interviews and next steps. Jean explained site graphics (existing conditions vs. POS site graphic, along with work currently under way including documentation of CDF's and ADA access explorations.
4. Comments from attendees:
 - 4.1. Request to add The Cultural Landscape Foundation to the list of stakeholders
 - 4.2. Question about how to share information from various groups: key stakeholder interview comments will be made available in the monthly reports and a full summary of the stakeholder interviews will be included in the appendix to the report.
 - 4.3. What is the channel for neighborhood input? Is there a separate public meeting? Discussion on this topic included the intention of the public meetings as a venue for public input. The public comments are an important aspect of the institutional knowledge of the space. Meeting attendees are welcome to comment at meetings or have discussions post meeting with the HSR team members and City representatives.
 - 4.4. Question: Does the use of the space dictate the future design? Explanation: The HSR is a technical document that will ultimately be a list of indisputable facts about the plaza, programming wish list from stakeholders, and recommendations for a Treatment Plan grounded on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.
 - 4.5. The document may make suggestions that make use of the space easier by stakeholders and user groups, under the umbrella of the Secretary of the Interior Standards.
 - 4.6. Comment: Peavey Plaza is an iconic space that is a draw for visitors. Once these iconic qualities are demolished they are gone forever.
 - 4.7. Comment about how the space is used when not programmed – needs to be thought through for safety, security, usability by the public.
 - 4.8. Existing flexibility in seating is part of the charm of the plaza and should be retained. Space is usable for small and large groups.

Date January 15, 2015

Project Name Peavey Plaza HSR

DFA Number 15-162

TO **Denita Lemmon, Miller Dunwiddie Matt Rentsch, Damon Farber**
Steve Cramer, Mpls DTC Peter Brown,
Kathryn Reali, Mpls DTC/DID Jennifer Swanson, City of Minneapolis
Leah Wong, DTC
 Jesse Osendorf, DID
 Jean Garbarini, Damon Farber

Note: Names in **bold** indicate attendance

From Matt Rentsch - mrentsch@damonfarber.com

Subject DTC/DID input on relationship/programming of Peavey Plaza

BUSINESS

1. Introductions - Denita
 - 1.1. Explained the goal of the project and the team members involved.
 - 1.2. Gave a synopsis of findings to date, including plaza history, modifications, etc. and presented graphic exhibits.
1. DTC Relationship with Peavey – Kathryn, Leah, Steve
 - 1.1. “Stop Gap”-Mpls Public Works is responsible for maintenance of Plaza
 - 1.2. DID attempts annual “greening”
 - 1.2.1. Have used Tangletown Gardens for a couple of years. They’ve provided planting of shrubs, light tree trimming, etc. in kind.
 - 1.2.2. Currently the plaza has more issues than the light greening efforts can bear.
 - 1.3. DTC has provided programming for Peavey for the last 25 years (day time and night time events)
 - 1.3.1. Music concerts (have grown from simple to multi-day events)
 - 1.3.2. Food vendors
 - 1.3.3. Special events-press conferences, pop-up shops, etc.
 - 1.3.4. Private events-partner with City of Mpls, YWCA, Orchestra Hall
 - 1.4. Permits for plaza usage explained
 - 1.4.1. Use of the park requires a permit issued by the City of Mpls
 - 1.4.2. There is no cost for this permit
 - 1.4.3. This permit is strictly for use of the space—no power or water amenity elements are included
 - 1.4.4. Users are required to obtain other permits from the City, depending on use (e.g. all night music, etc.)
 - 1.5. DTC has been granted the lead on maintaining the plaza usage calendar by the City.
 - 1.6. DTC usually has an individual present from the organization at all events.
 - 1.7. The City is usually not present.
2. DTC input on plaza elements vs programming – Kathryn, Leah, Steve
 - 2.1. “Lighting doesn’t work”
 - 2.1.1. Quality is too ambient, not evenly dispersed

- 2.1.1.1. Shadow-y areas are perceived as un-safe
- 2.1.2. Lights not easily replaced
 - 2.1.2.1. DID didn't know that the light standards may be dropped for maintenance—cranes have been brought in to change lights
- 2.1.3. All agreed that if the tree lights, fountain lights and pole lights were operable and dependable, the park would be most desirable
- 2.2. Entrances off of 12th and Nicollet sides are “not defined”
 - 2.2.1. Perceived confusion to plaza users
 - 2.2.1.1. How to enter the site
 - 2.2.1.2. Where allowed to go and not go within site
- 2.3. Lack of electricity to site
 - 2.3.1. Power needs have increased over the years with programming of concerts, vendors, etc.
 - 2.3.1.1. Power has been borrowed from the fountains
 - 2.3.1.2. Power may be pulled from Nicollet but the expense and inconvenience of lines and meters running is a negative
 - 2.3.1.3. It's unclear as to whether enough power can be brought in from Excel Energy with the Nicollet rebuild project
 - 2.3.1.4. Some power can be borrowed from Orchestra Hall but not ideal
- 2.4. Water basin
 - 2.4.1. Agreed that it is an “important dynamic feature” for drawing people to programming
 - 2.4.1.1. “The fountains alone are not enough of a draw for people”
 - 2.4.1.2. Majority of the time in the past, programming took place with the basin full
 - 2.4.1.3. If the water is not recirculating and clean, it becomes stagnant and drives people away
 - 2.4.1.4. Paver surface is uneven
 - 2.4.1.4.1. Suitable for standing on
 - 2.4.1.4.2. Unsuitable for chairs
 - 2.4.1.4.3. Currently floods because drains do not properly work, sump is broken
- 2.5. Additional amenity draws discussed
 - 2.5.1. Restaurant desired
 - 2.5.1.1. Brick and mortar preferred as liquor license would be more obtainable
 - 2.5.1.2. Location discussed
 - 2.5.1.2.1. DC thinks close to Nicollet more desirable than off 12th
 - 2.5.1.3. Discussion as to whether or not other businesses on Nicollet would appreciate this
 - 2.5.1.3.1. Competition might be a negative
 - 2.5.1.3.2. Another restaurant would be a positive
 - 2.5.2. Permanent restrooms
 - 2.5.2.1. Portable toilets are an eyesore and coordination issue
 - 2.5.2.2. Desirable as there is a lack of public restrooms downtown
 - 2.5.2.3. Orchestra Hall, Brits and Caribou currently let plaza users have use of restroom facilities
 - 2.5.2.4. DID completed a pilot project of nicer, flushable portable toilets one season on site (at lookout near corner fountain, on street level)
 - 2.5.2.4.1. “Uneventful” – no security issues at all
- 2.6. Plaza elements priorities ranked (1 most important):
 - 2.6.1. 1-proper amount of electricity
 - 2.6.2. 2-concessions
 - 2.6.3. 3-restrooms
- 2.7. Security and Safety
 - 2.7.1. Past events have had tents with extensive equipment there for days on end with security guards—never any issues with theft, etc
 - 2.7.2. When water is operating, fewer problems with illegal/unsavory activity

- 2.7.3. Peavey Plaza technically has “hours” of operation
- 2.7.4. All agreed it should be patrolled at night but left barrier free
- 2.7.5. DID does not currently go inside the plaza—scope creep
- 2.7.6. Public Works’ domain—as well as trash removal, cleaning, etc.
- 2.8. “An operating vision needs to be solidified”
 - 2.8.1. A Peavey budget should be added to the City budget as a separate line item
- 2.9. Equipment access for events
 - 2.9.1. Hand-carried up and down stairs currently
 - 2.9.1.1. Costly
 - 2.9.2. Temporary ramping has been used in the past to get to the “first level”
 - 2.9.3. Cranes used on 12th
 - 2.9.3.1. Blocks parking lane and 1 drive lane, sometimes more
 - 2.9.3.2. Police hired to direct traffic, creates expense
 - 2.9.4. Vendors have no location to load/unload without blocking traffic
- 2.10. Aesthetics
 - 2.10.1. Perceived as a “concrete jungle”, “not green enough”
 - 2.10.2. Concrete seems “grungy”
 - 2.10.3. Perception might change with cleaning of patina, added greening (e.g. green wall at Orchestra Hall plaza wall) and cleaned fountain towers—stainless steel might compliment new Nicollet features
- 2.11. ADA accessibility discussed
 - 2.11.1. Currently inconvenient for users with accessibility issues to take the long route to get access to different levels

-End of memo-

Date January 20, 2015

Project Name Peavey Plaza HSR

DFA Number 15-162

Attendees: **Denita Lemmon, Miller Dunwiddie**
Jean Garbarini, Damon Farber
Win Rockwell

By: Jean Garbarini, Damon Farber

Subject Greening Downtown Minneapolis: input on relationship/programming of Peavey Plaza

MINUTES

- 1.1. Win explained the development of and his responsibilities as Executive Director of Greening Downtown Minneapolis (GDM).
- 1.2. Win expects GDM to be charged with programming Peavey Plaza although a formal agreement with the City has not been fully executed.
- 1.3. GDM has completed preliminary budget numbers and expects the annual cost to run Peavey Plaza to be in the range of \$1,200,000. This number includes programming, security, and maintenance.
- 1.4. During the last year of regular maintenance by the City of Minneapolis, the budget for Peavey Plaza was \$250,000.
- 1.5. Win presented his paper on "The Fundamentals of Successful, Destination Urban Parks" and recommended the MIT publication "Places in the Making: How placemaking builds places and communities". Win referenced the Bryant Park Corporation and the renovation of Bryant Park several times as a key precedent to his approach to Peavey Plaza.
- 1.6. Win stated that there are three items that are critical to the success of Peavey Plaza's long term success. These elements are: 1. Permanent bathrooms 2. A restaurant or permanent food concessions structure (with liquor license) 3. Large flexible space for programming.
- 1.7. Win feels that he was not involved enough in the early programming decisions of Downtown East Commons and hopes to be far more involved in the planning for Peavey Plaza.
- 1.8. Win envisions the revenue sources for ongoing funding for Peavey Plaza to include both sales of food and beverages and sponsorship from corporations and adjacent institutions. His plan is to program an event every day in the space, some days the space will have multiple programs. The goal is for Peavey to be a known and expected entity for activity every day of the year and a draw for residents, visitors and downtown employees.
- 1.9. Some ideas for programming range from book groups to youth activities, music, health and fitness including but not limited to yoga, and performance.
- 1.10. Peavey would focus on performance more than Downtown East Commons.
- 1.11. Win would like to see a main plaza focal point in the vicinity of the western ½ of the main pool, where he feels the main focal point of the plaza lies.
- 1.12. Win would like the pool much smaller, to create a larger flat flexible space at pool level.
- 1.13. Win would like to see a large digital screen included in the space.
- 1.14. Anticipated revenue for food/beverage at the Downtown East Commons is \$500K/yr.
- 1.15. Win feels that the best location for restrooms and a permanent food service is near the 11th/Nicollet corner, possibly at the lowest level of the space.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Executive Summary	x
II. Introduction.....	x
Overview	
Methodology	
III. Developmental History	x
Location of Property	
Historical Background and Context	
Chronology and Timeline of Subsequent Modifications	
1974/2015 Spatial Organization and Land Pattern Diagrams (DFA)	
1975-2015 Modifications Diagram (DFA)	
1974/2015 Tree Plan (DFA)	
Analysis of Historic Significance	
Evaluation of Significance	
Integrity	
IV. Description and Assessment.....	x
Introduction and General Description	
Feature Condition Summaries	
Water Display	
Concrete Site Elements	
Site Furnishings	
Site Paving	
Site Lighting	
Planting	
V. Treatment Approach	x
Preservation Policies/Objectives	
Standards for the Treatment of Historic Buildings	
Applying Standards	
VI. Next Steps.....	x
Modification Considerations	
VII. Bibliography	x

Appendices:

- A. Original "Peavey Park Plaza" Drawings, M. Paul Friedberg & Associates, May 21, 1974.
- B. A National Register Assessment prepared by Hess, Roise and Company, June 2011.
- C. Historic American Landscape Survey: Written Historical and Descriptive Data and Drawings, prepared by Minnesota Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects, September 2006.
- D. Stakeholder Interview Conversation Notes and Summaries
- E. Fountain Schematic – As built condition of piping and controls by MCE 2015
- F. Existing Fountain Condition Summary and Recommendations – CMS Collaborative, Inc. 2015
- G. Existing Lighting Condition Summary and Recommendations – Schuler Shook 2015
- H. Testing Summary and Reports
- I. xxx

Date: 17 February 2016

RE: Peavey Plaza Historic Structures Report and Existing Condition Study
Stakeholder Interview – Preservation Community

From: Denita Lemmon

Project Goal

Progress with an open and inclusive process for gathering information relative to Peavey Plaza

Meeting Goals

Inform stakeholders of project process

Discuss ideas to supplement or change process if necessary

Discuss Historic Structures Report content

A) Overview – Work completed to date

- 1) Discussion and review of site with Minneapolis Water Works
 - a) Initial site tour and observation of conditions
- 2) Stakeholder Input Meetings
 - a) Initial meeting with MN Orchestral Association - complete
 - Follow up meeting scheduled for discussion to continue with staff
 - b) Meeting with Downtown Council and DID - complete
 - c) Meeting with Green Minneapolis – complete
 - d) Meeting with Preservation Community
 - e) Meeting with Minneapolis Advisory Committee on People with Disabilities - pending
 - f) Meeting with CPED - pending
 - g) Meeting with Construction Code Services - pending
- 3) Testing Scope
 - a) Concrete testing
 - Compressive strength
 - Petrographic
 - b) Steel Reinforcing
 - Radar
 - X-ray
 - c) Pipe and Conduit
 - Fiber optic mapping
 - Flood testing
 - Pressure testing

B) Historic Structures Report Content

- 1) See attached index
- 2) Summary of changes – see attached
 - 1974/2015 Spatial Organization and Land Pattern Diagrams
 - 1974/2015 Modifications Diagrams
 - 1974/2015 Tree Plan
- 3) Character Defining Features

Date February 22, 2016

Project Name Peavey Plaza HSR

DFA Number 15-162

Attendees: Denita Lemmon, Miller Dunwiddie
 Jean Garbarini, Damon Farber
 Greg Geiger, Manager of Concert Enhancements and Concessions, MOA
 David Sailer-Haugland, Director of Marketing, Subscription Sales and Audience Services, MOA
 Scott Feldman, Event and Facility Sales Manager, MOA
 Michael Diblasi, Schuler Shook

By: Jean Garbarini, Damon Farber

Subject MOA events/programming staff: additional input on of Peavey Plaza

BUSINESS

1. MOA manages events in the plaza for outside groups when a combination of indoor and outdoor accommodations are desirable. MOA event staff provides rental, setup, production, catering, liquor license, restroom facilities, and event coordination
2. The largest need for the space is electrical setup – having appropriately sized electrical systems easily available would make events much easier.
3. MOA would prefer that the pool be zero depth, but if it is not, the pool should retain a consistent elevation for easier programming.
4. Main entrance feels unwelcoming right now – trees and green would help.
5. Small stage set up is best located at the base of the amphitheater space. Large stage set up is best located at the 12th Street side of the pool
6. Temporary perimeter control would be nice – if not built in it can be temporary/rented product.
7. December access into the space is appealing and would be used – December is a high event month for the MOA.
8. Shade is important in the space – trees are positive element in the space.
9. Food trucks would be ideal for event support if allowed. Current City Ordinance does not allow food trucks at city metered spaces.
10. Usable seating would be a good addition to the space. Moveable tables and chairs would be great in addition to more fixed seating.
11. MOA is interested in being more connected to the plaza
12. Addition of art would be great in the plaza – something that was interactive with music would be ideal.
13. MOA program/event staff believes that the space will be most successful if it is as flexible as possible.
14. MOA program/event staff does not feel that a permanent café facility would be profitable in the plaza.
15. MOA is open to discussing the use of public restrooms with non-MOA events, but this can be complicated if MOA is hosting their own large events concurrently.
16. MOA would like to be closely involved in coordinating the scheduling in the plaza. Set up for large events will complicate daily programming. Large programmed events in the plaza could be a conflict for the MOA's schedule from a use, access, and noise perspective.
17. Main months for MOA events are December and July.

18. Staff encouraged us to explore the opportunities for performance on some of the small plinths at the edge of the pool.
19. Tent support sleeving in pool basin would be beneficial.
20. Equipment access into the space would be ideal, but if not available MOA will continue to use a crane to move stage, rigging and other equipment in and out of the plaza.
21. MOA President and CEO would like Peavey and the MOA building to be more sustainable, and if they can work together towards this goal the MOA will support in any way they can.

Welcome and introductions.

- a. Review of Process and meeting intent
- b. Secretary of Interior Standards
- c. Integrity and character of Peavey Plaza
- d. Scope of work impact

Scope of Work-Review and Input:

1. VEGETATION

- a. What is the intent of the turf panels? They are meant to be places for rest/relaxation, as well as provide a flexible surface for daily use. The green of the turf offsets the coldness of the surrounding concrete and adds an element of “softness” to the overall aesthetic of the plaza.
- b. The turf did not successfully grow and thrive at Peavey Plaza due to constant use and a lack of adequate sunlight. Perhaps one way to create a more durable green turf-scape would be to use engineered grass, which may be able to better withstand daily use. Still, there is the continued issue of sunlight (or lack thereof).
- c. Long-term planning with regards to specimen replacement at Peavey Plaza was agreed to be an important factor in creating a successful landscape. Having a phasing plan (incorporated with city planning) would allow for replacement over time and in stages without having to replace all trees (for example) at once. Paying attention to the life span of the vegetation at Peavey is believed to play a key role in determining the future success of the plaza.
- d. Can seasonal interest with respect to vegetation be maintained at Peavey Plaza without destroying the original intent of the design? It is believed that it would be nice to offer variety and color throughout the year.

2. WATER FEATURES

- a. Do the water features meet current code standards? Yes, the current functionality meets code and will also have a full treatment system (will be treated as a pool).
- b. Did the original design team anticipate the weathering of canisters? According to Jean Garbarini, the Friedberg team was shocked to learn about its current discoloration.
- c. The overarching dilemma pertaining to the current patina of the canisters is whether to clean them or not. Also, what is the correct product to clean the canisters with? Testing will have to be done to determine the best method.
- d. Since the canisters have been discolored for so long, most people do not realize that they were originally silver. Would transforming them back to their original state create public outrage? One meeting member who saw the plaza when it was first opened believed that the silver was too “shiny” and cautioned against cleaning the canisters, which he believes will prove to be more difficult than anticipated. Another meeting member was worried that if the canisters were transformed back to silver, they might look strange against the patina of the concrete. Conversely, another member mentioned that the silver color of the canisters would place more focus on the water coming out of the fountain (when fixed), while the current yellowing of the canisters focuses more on the structure of the structures themselves. It was also commented that the most important thing for Peavey Plaza is to have the canisters function/working again and that the patina (or lack thereof) should not

take precedence over this objective.

- e. Will there be a clause to fix any issues with the cleaning of the canisters? This could be a possibility.

3. SPATIAL ORGANIZATION/CIRCULATION

- a. Will there be accessibility concerns with replacing/updating existing paving? Not with appropriate installation techniques.
- b. An important issue of replacing paving is durability and how to replace existing materials. Appearance could change if materials are used that are different from the existing paving. Since all of the existing materials were custom made. It could make sense to recreate the molds used to build specific paving, but only if there is a need to replace a great number of paving (otherwise it does not make sense from a financial standpoint).
- c. Most likely there needs to be replacement across the entirety of the site. Almost all the paving needs to be replaced or repaired due to the high amount of settlement and displacement over the years since Peavey was first built.
- d. Damon Farber recommends "replacement in kind," which could be very expensive as the materials might not be readily available.

4. STRUCTURES

- a. Although the majority of the concrete structures have held up well over time, it is recommended that there will be epoxy injections into cracks and the addition of control joints in places where they are lacking to prevent further disrepair.
- b. The need to remove graffiti is also a high priority to the preservation of Peavey Park, as is the need to replace the bridge areas, where the concrete is actually failing.
- c. Meeting members wondered whether or not removing the patina from the concrete would actually work and it was noted that cleaning methods will have different reactions in different areas within the park (which could ultimately create a disjointed appearance), especially since one treatment type will most likely be used across the entire plaza.
- d. Should areas that were/will be patched be stained? Will this create an entirely new effect across the surface of the concrete when it ages?
- e. One member worried that after it is cleaned, the concrete will go through a re-aging process that initially is not very attractive.
- f. It was asked whether or not the patina was harmful to the overarching quality/design intent of the site. It was recommended that the answer to this issue be determined to help guide the rest of the project.
- g. Another community member wished to have the parameters of the project established to better help direct how to treat the site. Should Peavey be considered a preservation project, a rehabilitation project, a restoration project, or a reconstruction project?
- h. What if money is spent to clean the concrete and it ends up looking exactly the same? Will be public like it if it is not "new and shiny?"

5. LIGHTING

- a. The lighting can be restored back to its original state and re-wired with LED lights. In addition, the housing of the individual lighting units will also need to be repaired to prevent moisture from leaking in.
- b. There was general support for the idea that contemporary technology will allow for temporary changes to be made within permanent existing lighting fixtures for special events (ie changing the color of the lights). It was deemed a great idea to have variety within the constraints of the original designs, as this does not affect the historical character of the site. It was also noted that the theming of public spaces with color/light during specific events is a good way to create community unity.

6. SITE FURNISHINGS

- a. It is feasible to add additional seating to the plaza (as long as it is sympathetic to the original design). There was support for the idea of flexible, movable seating, while fixed seating was deemed to be too restrictive and has the potential to block off potential use.
- b. One meeting member commented that it would be great to have backs on the seating, as people like to have something to lean up against.
- c. ADA handrails need to be added to existing handrails, which do not meet code (the current diameter is too large).

7. ADDED ELEMENTS-NOT ORIGINAL TO SITE

- a. There was support for the removal of non-original elements added to site (for example, the wood retaining walls built to fix erosion and to provide plants with greater access to the sun.

8. ACCESSIBLE ROUTE OPTIONS

- a. How many ADA access routes are required? TBD. The intent is to create equal access to the plaza but not necessarily to every component of plaza itself.
- b. It is believed that ADA access would be provided where there is the best access to programming.
- c. Option C is deemed a good option for an ADA access route due to its proximity to Nicollet Mall. It also provides access to more levels than just top and bottom (with stairs) and it is suggested that this option is best in keeping with the character of site and could provide a design solution that best goes with the space itself.
- d. The elevator option was not popular and deemed a heavy-handed touch that opened up a lot of questions-should it be open 24 hours a day, how does the city prevent loitering at the elevator, how destructive will its construction be to the site?

9. EVENT USE ENHANCEMENTS

- a. It was commented that option 13.C.4 (to reduce the size of the pool with an infill platform) was not a good idea and that the reflecting pool should remain as big as possible.
- b. It was suggested that creating staging areas/decks on the east and south (13.C.2 and 13.C.3) sides of the reflecting pool are great options for generating spaces for alternative/special events at the site.

10. RESTROOMS

- a. The subject of restrooms was not a popular one at the meeting. Members had concerns with maintenance, loitering, and cleanliness. People were also concerned about the visual intrusiveness of building public restrooms on the site.
- b. One meeting member commented that if restrooms were to be built this would help to determine where the ADA access routes would need to be placed.

11. FOOD SERVICE

- a. Again, there did not seem to be great support for this possibility. It was pointed out that Peavey Plaza was in close proximity to other restaurants and cafes in the area so there seemed to be little need to build a food service area at the site itself.
- b. It was brought up that providing a food service building could create revenue for the upkeep and maintenance of the site, which was countered with skepticism about the viability of this notion. Would a small café-type space actually generate enough money to be helpful from a financial stand-point (how big would said café have to be to actually make a profit for Peavey Park, especially since it would most likely only be open

seasonally)?

- c. Meeting members were not fond of the idea of having to give up valuable real estate to either restrooms and/or food service buildings.
- d. The idea of food cart/trucks and sanitary portable toilets was deemed a more viable option. It was pointed out that during special events there should be a designated area for such programs, so that when people come to visit the Plaza they will always know where to find the food/restrooms.